



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

31

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/622,635	10/12/2000	Olli Kallioniemi	4239-55278	8528

36218 7590 04/20/2006

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP
121 S.W. SALMON STREET
SUITE #1600
PORTLAND, OR 97204-2988

EXAMINER

FORMAN, BETTY J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1634

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/622,635

Applicant(s)

KALLIONIEMI ET AL.

Examiner

BJ Forman

Art Unit

1634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-9, 11, 12, 14, 16-20, 22, 24-42, 46-63, 66-78, 86-89, 91, 92, 98-100 and 114-123 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1,2,4-9,11,12,14,16-20,22,24-42,46-63,66-78,86-89,91,92,98-100 and 114-123.

Art Unit: 1634

FINAL ACTION

Status of the Claims

1. This action is in response to papers filed 30 January 2006 in which claims 1, 16, 17, 53 and 88 were amended.

The amendments have been thoroughly reviewed and entered.

The previous rejections in the Office Action dated 28 July 2005, not reiterated below, are withdrawn in view of the amendments. Applicant's arguments have been thoroughly reviewed and are discussed below as they apply to the instant grounds for rejection.

Claims 1,2,4-9,11,12,14,16-20,22,24-42,46-63,66-78,86-89,91,92,98-100 and 114-123 are under prosecution.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-12, 14, 16-20, 29-30, 49, 53-61, 70, 87-89, 91-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Enghardt et al (Journal of Histotechnology, 1995, 18(1): 51-55).

Art Unit: 1634

Regarding Claim 1, Enghardt et al disclose a method of parallel analysis of biological specimens comprising obtaining a plurality of donor specimens, placing each donor specimen in an assigned location in a recipient array (cassette, and page 55, second full paragraph), obtaining a plurality of copies of the recipient array such that the copies maintain their assigned locations (page 53, right column "slides"), performing analysis of each copy and comparing the results of the analysis i.e. immunostained and analyzed (page 53, last paragraph-page 54, left column). Enghardt et al further teach the method compares first array to a second array wherein using different assays i.e. the slides are stained with the antibodies so as to illustrate individual binding to tissues (Fig. 3) and the arrays are assayed for antibody staining to the test array to identify prognostic target for disease and/or presence of protein i.e. melanoma-antibody HMB-45 (Fig. 3).

Regarding Claim 2, Enghardt et al disclose the method wherein the donor specimen is obtained by boring (i.e. punched) an elongated sample from the specimen (page 53, paragraph spanning left to right column).

Regarding Claim 4, Enghardt et al disclose the method wherein the donor specimen is from a population of cells i.e. tumor tissue (Fig. 3).

Regarding Claim 5, Enghardt et al disclose the method wherein the donor specimen is from a cytological preparation i.e. tumor cells (Fig. 3).

Regarding Claim 6, Enghardt et al disclose the method wherein placing the donor specimen in an assigned location comprises forming an elongated receptacle in a donor block (page 52, right column), obtaining an elongated specimen (page 53, right column) and obtaining a plurality of copies by sectioning the array transverse to the donor specimen (page 53, right column, "slides" and Fig. 2).

Regarding Claim 7, Enghardt et al disclose the method wherein the donor specimen is placed in a receptacle having a size and shape "complementary" to the size and shape of the specimen (page 52, right column and page 53, right column).

Art Unit: 1634

Regarding Claim 8, Enghardt et al disclose the method wherein forming the elongated receptacle comprises forming a cylindrical bore in the recipient block and the donor specimen is obtained by boring a cylindrical tissue specimen from the donor block wherein the diameters of the receptacle and donor are substantially the same (pages 52-53).

Regarding Claim 9, Enghardt et al disclose the method further comprising associating a clinical characteristic with each assigned location i.e. diagnosis (page 55, first paragraph).

Regarding Claim 11, Enghardt et al disclose the method wherein the analysis is immunological analysis (page 54, left column and page 52, Table 1).

Regarding Claim 12, Enghardt et al disclose the method further comprising determining whether there are correlations between clinical characteristics associated with each location (page 55, left column).

Regarding Claim 14, Enghardt et al disclose the method wherein clinical characteristics are determined apart from array analysis and the characteristics are tumor grade, size or status i.e. diagnosis (page 55, first paragraph).

Regarding Claim 16, Enghardt et al disclose a method of parallel analysis of biological specimens comprising forming a donor block comprising a biological specimen embedded in embedding medium (page 51, right column and page 53) obtaining a plurality of donor specimens cores (page 53), boring recipient cores from recipient embedding medium form an array of elongated receptacles (page 52, right column) placing each donor cores in the elongated receptacles at assigned locations (page 53) sectioning the recipient embedding medium transverse to the elongated receptacles (page 53 "slides") performing different biological analysis on each cross-section and comparing the results to determine correlations (page 53, last paragraph-page 54, left column). Enghardt et al further teach the method compares first array to a second array wherein using different assays i.e. the slides are stained with the antibodies so as to illustrate individual binding to tissues (Fig. 3) and the arrays are

Art Unit: 1634

assayed for antibody staining to the test array to identify prognostic target for disease and/or presence of protein i.e. melanoma-antibody HMB-45 (Fig. 3).

Regarding Claim 17, Enghardt et al disclose the method further comprising comparing the results to clinical information about the specimen (page 54, left column and Fig. 3).

Regarding Claim 18, Enghardt et al disclose the method wherein the specimen is from a tumor (Fig.3).

Regarding Claim 19, Enghardt et al disclose the method wherein the analysis is immunological analysis (page 54, left column and page 52, Table 1).

Regarding Claim 20, Enghardt et al disclose the method further comprising comparing the results to clinical information about the subject from whom the specimen was obtained (page 55, left column and Fig. 3).

Regarding Claim 29-30, Enghardt et al disclose the method wherein the comparing comprises determination of protein expression by immunological analysis (Table 1 and page 53-54).

Regarding Claim 49, Enghardt et al disclose the method wherein donor specimens are from one or more tumors (Fig.3).

Regarding Claim 53, Enghardt et al disclose a method of analyzing cellular specimens in a matrix with specimens positioned at predetermined known locations such that multiple copies of the matrix are provided in a two dimensional array, the method comprising exposing sequential copies of the matrix to an agent which interacts with the specimens to identify specimens which share a biological property i.e. antibody binding (pages 53-54). Enghardt et al further teach the method compares first array to a second array wherein using different assays i.e. the slides are stained with the antibodies so as to illustrate individual binding to tissues (Fig. 3) and the arrays are assayed for antibody staining to the test array to identify prognostic target for disease and/or presence of protein i.e. melanoma-antibody HMB-45 (Fig. 3).

Art Unit: 1634

Regarding Claim 54, Enghardt et al disclose the method wherein the specimens are provided in an elongated form and multiple copies are made by sectioning from a three dimensional array such that sequential section maintain a predetermined relationship (page 52, right column and page 53, right column).

Regarding Claim 55, Enghardt et al disclose the method wherein the shared biological property is a molecular characteristic i.e. antibody binding partner (Table 1 and pages 53-54).

Regarding Claim 56, Enghardt et al disclose the method wherein the shared biological property is presence of a protein (Table 1).

Regarding Claim 57, Enghardt et al disclose the method wherein the property is a specific reaction with an antibody specific for a specimen of interest (Table 1).

Regarding Claim 58, Enghardt et al disclose the method wherein the property is “correlated” with an other characteristic of the specimens (Table 1). As stated above, the claim is unclear because “other characteristic” is not defined or described. Additionally, the claim language “correlated” is very broad and interpreted thusly. As such, the protein expression and antibody binding are two characteristics analyzed by Enghardt that meet the limitations of the claim.

Regarding Claim 59, Enghardt et al disclose the method wherein the property includes clinical information about the subject i.e. diagnosis (page 55, left column).

Regarding Claim 60, Enghardt et al disclose the method wherein clinical information includes tumor grade, size or status i.e. diagnosis (page 55, first paragraph).

Regarding Claim 61, Enghardt et al disclose the method wherein the specimen is a tissue specimen (Fig.3).

Regarding Claim 70, Enghardt et al disclose the method wherein the specimens comprise animal cells i.e. tissue cells (Fig. 3).

Regarding Claim 87, Enghardt et al disclose the method wherein the method does not destroy the morphology of the specimen (page 51, right column).

Art Unit: 1634

Regarding Claim 88, Enghardt et al disclose a method of parallel analysis of biological specimens comprising obtaining a plurality of donor specimens, placing each donor specimen in an assigned location in a recipient array (cassette, and page 55, second full paragraph), obtaining a plurality of copies of the recipient array such that the copies maintain their assigned locations (page 53, right column "slides"), performing analysis of each copy and comparing the results of the analysis i.e. immunostained and analyzed (page 53, last paragraph-page 54, left column). Enghardt et al further teach the method compares first array to a second array wherein using different assays i.e. the slides are stained with the antibodies so as to illustrate individual binding to tissues (Fig. 3) and the arrays are assayed for antibody staining to the test array to identify prognostic target for disease and/or presence of protein i.e. melanoma-antibody HMB-45 (Fig. 3).

Regarding Claim 89, Enghardt et al disclose the method of Claim 1 further comprising correlating information concerning the specimen with the analysis wherein the information includes tumor grade, size or status i.e. diagnosis (page 55, first paragraph).

Regarding Claim 91, Enghardt et al disclose the method further comprising obtaining donor specimens from a predetermined morphologically defined region of a tumor (e.g. controls and lymph nodes (page 53, left column and Fig. 3).

Regarding Claim 92, Enghardt et al disclose the method further comprising obtaining donor specimens from a predetermined cell structure (e.g. controls and lymph nodes (page 53, left column and Fig. 3).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant asserts that Enghardt does not teach subjecting successive copies or sections of the array to first and second assays. The argument has been considered but is not found persuasive because as cited above, Enghardt et al specifically teach production of successive slides (i.e. "Four um thick sections from the MTCB were placed on positively charged slides." page 53, next to last paragraph; and "We treated **all** slides.....", page 53, last paragraph;

Art Unit: 1634

"Slides were placed horizontally on slide holders and positioned in the instrument.....a buffer rinse was followed by application of primary antibodies.", page 54, second paragraph; "After a cleansing with a buffer, biotinylated goat anti-mouse secondary immunoglobulin (Biongenex) was applied" page 54, fourth paragraph). Hence, Enghardt uses a single secondary antibody to label all the primary antibodies. This single label requires that the different primary antibodies being tested be placed on different slides because absent this differential incubation, there would be no means for determining which antibodies were binding to the tissues. Enghardt illustrates individual antibody binding in the "Results" (page 54, eighth paragraph citing Fig. 3A-B). The legend for the figure defines the illustration as single antibody staining i.e. HMB-45. From this, it is clear that the reference constructs multiple slides and exposes the slides to different antibodies for analysis.

Applicant asserts that Enghardt does not teach analysis of successive targets. Applicant further asserts that the control comparison of Enghardt is performed on the same slide, and not on a different array as claimed. The argument has been considered but is not found persuasive because as discussed above, Enghardt specifically teaches multiple slides for analysis of 12 antibodies (page, 53, right column, 8th paragraph-end of page).

Furthermore, Enghardt teaches that each specimen is in an assigned x-y coordinate location, "The rods were inserted into the empty holes of the recipient blank according to the prescribed pattern." (page 53, right column, lines 3-4) wherein substantial copies of each array are on a separate support, "Four um thick sections from the MTCB were placed on positively charged slides." (page 53, next to last paragraph).

Art Unit: 1634

5. Claims 32-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by An et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,882,864, issued 16 March 1999).

Regarding Claim 32, An et al disclose the method of analyzing genetic changes and gene expression in a tissue specimen (Abstract) the method comprising screening multiple genes with a nucleic acid array (Column 3, lines 35-48) and screening multiple biological specimens in a specimen array with a nucleic acid probe to detect genes which are abnormally expressed (Column 4, lines 18-67) wherein the results of nucleic acid array screening is used to probe the biological specimens (Column 2, line 56-Column 3, lines 9 and Examples 1-2).

Regarding Claims 33-34, An et al disclose the method wherein the screening comprises high throughput genomic technique i.e. oligonucleotide arrays (Column 10, lines 43-45).

Regarding Claim 35, An et al teach the method wherein screening comprises searching database or other biomedical information sources (Column 3, lines 45-49).

Regarding Claim 36, An et al teach the method wherein the screening comprises using a cDNA array (Column 8, lines 7-35).

Regarding Claim 37, An et al disclose the method wherein the screening comprises a DNA is assayed for a genetic marker (Column 7, lines 41-49).

Regarding Claim 38, An et al disclose the method wherein the array comprises loci that undergo differential expression in cancer (Column 7, line 41-Column 8, line 5).

Regarding Claim 39, An et al disclose the method wherein the screening comprises hybridizing nucleic acids associated with a cell with the array and determining which loci indicate differential expression (Column 7, line 41-Column 8, line 5 and Fig. 1-15).

Regarding Claim 40, An et al disclose the method further comprising selecting a target that undergoes differential expression and using the probe to screen the specimens (Column 7, line 41-Column 8, line 5 and Fig. 1-15).

Regarding Claim 41-42, An et al disclose the method wherein the specimen is a tumor specimen (Column 7, lines 41-49).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant asserts that An et al does not teach a nucleic acid array as required by the instant claims. Applicant further asserts that the Northern Blot assay of An et al is not a biological specimen microarray. The argument has been considered but is not found persuasive. The instant claims are drawn to a nucleic acid array and a "biological specimen microarray". However, neither the array nor microarray are defined, described or limited by structure and/or size. An et al specifically teaches the probes are immobilized onto a solid support (Column 3, lines 35-48, Column 10, lines 43-45). Because An et al teach nucleic acid probes on a solid support and because the claims do not define any additional structure and/or size for the array and microarray, any of the solid supports of An et al are encompassed by the broadly claimed arrays and microarrays.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 22, 46-48 and 98-100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enhardt et al (Journal of Histotechnology, 1995, 18(1): 51-55)

Regarding Claims 22 and 98-100, Enhardt et al disclose the method wherein the donor core is substantially cylindrical and has a diameter of "about" 1mm (page 53). Enhardt et al do not teach a diameter of less than 1mm (or 0.3 to 2.0) and a length of 1 to 4 mm. However, the courts have stated that claimed dimensions of a known device do not distinguish over the prior art device when the claimed device would not perform differently from the prior art device.

Art Unit: 1634

In Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc., 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984), the Federal Circuit held that, where the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art device. Therefore, the instantly claimed dimensions would have been an obvious variation of the dimensions of Enghardt et al.

Regarding Claim 46-48, Enghardt et al teach the method wherein analysis specifically includes reagent analysis, quality control and analysis of differentiation (page 55, left column). They do not teach the intended uses recited in Claims 45-48. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply the method of Enghardt et al for claimed uses based on tissue being examined and anticipated diagnosis.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant relies on the arguments discussed above regarding Stapleton and Enghardt and Applicant asserts that An does not teach the lacking elements. Those arguments have not been found persuasive as discussed above.

10. Claims 24-28 and 114-123 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enghardt et al (Journal of Histotechnology, 1995, 18(1): 51-55) in view of An et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,882,864, issued 16 March 1999).

Regarding Claims 24-28, Enghardt et al disclose a method of parallel analysis of biological specimens comprising obtaining a plurality of donor specimens, placing each donor specimen in an assigned location in a recipient array (cassette, and page 55, second full paragraph) but they do not teach the method array comprises an arrangement of nucleic acids

Art Unit: 1634

on a matrix. However, An et al disclose a similar method of analyzing genetic changes and gene expression in a tissue specimen (Abstract) the method comprising screening multiple genes with a nucleic acid array to identify a biomarker (Column 3, lines 35-48) wherein the array is an oligonucleotide array (Column 10, lines 43-45), the biomarker is selected by genetic analysis (Column 3, lines 31-49) wherein the marker is a marker for gene expression and /or altered gene or its function (Column 7, line 41-Column 8, line 6) and wherein the arrayed markers facilitate diagnosis and treatment (Column 3, lines 1-9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to apply the marker identification of An et al to the tumor analysis method of Enghardt et al for the expected benefit of facilitating diagnosis and treatment of tumors as taught by An et al (Column 3, lines 1-9).

Regarding Claim 114, 115, 119-123, An et al teach the similar method wherein further examination of tissues at the antibody and/or nucleic acid level is used to further distinguish tumor from non-tumor samples (Column 58, line 55-Column 59, line 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the tissue analysis of Enghardt et al by the further coupled antibody and nucleic acid analysis e.g. in-situ hybridization as suggested by An et al for the expected benefit of further distinguishing tumor from non-tumor samples as taught by An et al (Column 58, line 55-Column 59, line 7).

Regarding Claim 116-118, An et al teach the similar method wherein the probes are for an Oncogene (Column 7, line 41-Column 8, line 7) and wherein the tissues are of different stages (progression) and the assays are performed to determine expression (Column 64, lines 28-43)

Art Unit: 1634

11. Claims 31, 50-52, 62-63, 68-69, 71-78 and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enghardt et al (Journal of Histotechnology, 1995, 18(1): 51-55) in view of Stapleton et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,103,192, issued 15 August 2000).

Regarding Claims 31, 50-52 and 86, Enghardt et al teach the method wherein a plurality of different tumor tissues are analyzed but they do not specifically teach breast, bladder or prostate tumors, or from a plurality of tumors of the same type. However, Stapleton et al teach the similar method wherein the specimen is breast and/or from plurality of tumors of the same or different type and wherein the method is applicable to any tissue (Column 6 and Example 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the tumor specimens of Enghardt and Stapleton by analyzing different specimens of the same tissue e.g. breast, prostate or bladder for the obvious benefits of comparative analysis of normal and patient specimens as taught by Stapleton (Column 6, lines 15-25).

Regarding Claim 62-63, 68-69, 71-78, Stapleton et al teach their method wherein the cellular specimen is a cellular suspension that has been converted into a solid specimen (Column 9, line 61-Column 10, line 14) and wherein the suspension is from a body fluid e.g. malignancy from one or more cell lines and immobilized on a support (Column 11, line 27-Column 12, line 50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the tissue cells of Enghardt et al with clinically important cell suspensions as taught by Stapleton et al for the obvious benefits of inexpensive, rapid and sensitive diagnosis of clinically important specimens at the nucleic acid level as taught by Stapleton et al (Column 5, lines 1-48). Stapleton further teach the method wherein normal tissues are compared to patient tissues (Column 6, lines 20-25) but they do not specifically teach the normal tissues are from a model organism or at different stages of tumor progression. However, it would have been further obvious to analyze tumors from a model

Art Unit: 1634

organism and/or at different stages of progression for the obvious benefits of providing a stage-specific analysis and subsequently providing stage-specific treatment based on the analysis.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant relies on the arguments discussed above regarding Stapleton and Enghardt and Applicant asserts that An does not teach the lacking elements. Those arguments have not been found persuasive as discussed above.

13. Claims 66 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enghardt et al (Journal of Histotechnology, 1995, 18(1): 51-55) in view of Stapleton et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,103,192, issued 15 August 2000) and An et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,882,864, issued 16 March 1999).

Regarding Claims 66 and 67, Enghardt et al disclose a method of parallel analysis of biological specimens comprising obtaining a plurality of donor specimens, placing each donor specimen in an assigned location in a recipient array (cassette, and page 55, second full paragraph), obtaining a plurality of copies of the recipient array such that the copies maintain their assigned locations (page 53, right column "slides"), performing analysis of each copy and comparing the results of the analysis i.e. immunostained and analyzed (page 53, last paragraph-page 54, left column).

Enghardt et al do not teach using a nucleic acid array to identify a biomarker. However, nucleic acid array identification of biomarkers was well known in the art at the time the claimed invention was made as taught by Stapleton et al (Column 1, lines 20-40).

Stapleton et al teach a similar method of parallel analysis of biological specimens comprising obtaining a plurality of donor specimens, placing each donor specimen in an assigned location in a recipient array (matrix) and performing analysis of the specimens using a nucleic acid microarray (Column 1, lines 20-40) wherein the marker is selected by genetic

Art Unit: 1634

analysis; wherein the marker is for gene expression and altered gene expression in for various tumor and diagnostic analysis (Column 6, lines 1-25; Column 16, lines 15-18; and Example 7). Stapleton et al further teach a motivation for using the microarray analysis i.e. minimizes the amount of specimen required for analysis and eliminates the need to extract nucleic acids from the sample (Column 5, lines 1-5 and 33-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to apply the nucleic acid microarray analysis of Stapleton et al to the specimen analysis of Enghardt et al for the expected benefits of inexpensive, rapid and sensitive diagnosis of clinically important tumors at the nucleic acid level as taught by Stapleton et al (Column 5, lines 1-48).

Enghardt et al and Stapleton do not teach their screening is used to select a probe for an array. However, An et al teach a similar method of tissue specimen analysis wherein the analysis provides disease-specific probes for diagnosis of tumors and specifically her-2 analysis (Column 2, line 56-Column 3, lines 9 and Claim 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to apply the probe selection and her-2 analysis of An et al to the method of Enghardt et al and Stapleton et al to thereby select the arrayed probes from their screening step for the expected benefit of providing an array of disease-specific probes for diagnosis of tumors as taught by An et al (Column 2, line 56-Column 3, lines 9).

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant relies on the arguments discussed above regarding Stapleton and Enghardt and Applicant asserts that An does not teach the lacking elements. Those arguments have not been found persuasive as discussed above.

Art Unit: 1634

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

16. No claim is allowed.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BJ Forman whose telephone number is (571) 272-0741. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00 TO 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla can be reached on (571) 272-0735. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Art Unit: 1634

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.



BJ Forman, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1634
April 12, 2006